PINE FORD STUDY

Big River Mine
Mo D981126899
17.8
Pine Ford Study
5-1-82

PUBLIC INFORMATION FACT SHEET
NUMBER 3

SUMMARY FACT SHEET OF THE FEBRUARY 10 AND 11, 1982 PUBLIC MEETING WORKSHOPS

Meetings Late Summer '82

US Army Corps of Engineers
St. Louis District

MAY 1982

SUMMARY FACT SHEET OF THE 10 AND 11 FEBRUARY 1982 PUBLIC MEETING WORKSHOPS

Purpose

This is the third in a series of fact sheets designed to keep you informed of what is happening during the Pine Ford Study. In this fact sheet we will briefly define the study, outline the study process, tell you where we are in that process and how we got there, detail the events that have taken place since the last fact sheet and outline future events.

The Study

The Pine Ford Lake Project was originally authorized by Congress in 1966 as one of the major lake projects in a comprehensive plan for water resources development in the Meramec River Basin. When Congress provided funds for additional planning several years ago, the Corps of Engineers determined that the economic and physical conditions and social preferences in the area had changed significantly. The Corps came to the conclusion that the project needed to be reformulated. This meant that lake type projects would not be given preference, but would be considered along with various other structural and non-structural alternatives designed to serve the purposes of flood control, recreation, water supply and others.

The Study Process

The Pine Ford Study is being carried out essentially in the following sequence: (1) Identifying the area's problems and needs, (2) Inventorying the significant resources likely to be affected, (3) Formulating various plans to address the problems, (4) Evaluating the effects of these plans, (5) Comparing the alternative plans and (6) Selecting the most suitable plan for recommendation. Every effort is being made to involve you, the general public, and other agencies in performing these study tasks.

Where Are We?

We have been concentrating on accomplishing the first three steps in some detail and have made a "first pass" through all six steps as we prepared a draft report for review at higher levels within the Corps organization.

How Did We Get Here?

The area's problems and needs were identified by a combination of techniques including technical studies, historical records, communication with other agencies and by talking with you, the affected public.

In late October 1982, we held two workshops in the study area during which many water-related problems, concerns, and needs were identified and rated by order of importance. We combined and summarized the statements from the people into the following topics:

- flooding
- water supply
- water quality
- recreation
- environmental quality
- erosion control
- fish and wildlife
- cultural resources
- economic development
- land use
- hydropower
- navigation
- management
- transportation

As we prepared for the next round of public meeting workshops, we realized that we'd have to narrow the list of problems and concerns if we expected to cover all of the various problem-solving measures over the course of a one-evening meeting. So, we "boiled down" the list into four major categories: environmental/water quality, water supply, flooding and recreation. We also decided to stay with the same kind of meeting format that seemed to work well at the earlier meetings: a short general session followed by smaller group sessions where the people would have a chance to ask questions and to express their preferences. Our objectives in conducting these meetings were: (1) to give the people as much information as possible about the overall study and about the various measures that could be used to help solve the problems, (2) to give everyone attending the meeting a chance to discuss the measures, especially the advantages and disadvantages, and (3) to find out which measures were preferred.

February 1982 Public Meeting Workshops

Where and Who

A major component of the Pine Ford Public Involvement Program for Stage 2, Evaluation of Alternative Measures, was the exchange of information through public workshops. These workshops were held at Jefferson College in Hillsboro and the Holiday Inn in Eureka, Missouri, on the evenings of February 10 and 11, 1981, respectively. A total of 101 people attended: 36 participating at Hillsboro and the remaining 65 at Eureka. As indicated by Table 1, most attendees categorized themselves as interested individuals (40.6%) and stakeholders (31.7%). The remaining participants were public officials, agency representatives, interest group representatives, and media personnel.

Most people came from communities in St. Louis County and Jefferson County (Table 1). No one from St. Francois and Washington Counties attended the sessions. Over half of the participants had not attended the October 1981 workshops.

Information Provided

During the registration period at the workshops, each person was given a packet containing information on each of the measures being considered. Descriptions of each measure along with potential locations, estimated costs, benefits, and advantages and disadvantages were presented. Everyone was encouraged to review this material prior to the small group sessions. A glossary of related terms and evaluation forms for use during the small group session were distributed, and previous fact sheets, the Pine Ford Notebook, and the Self-Guided Tours were available.

TABLE 1
REGISTRATION SUMMARY

CATEGORY OF INTEREST	EUREKA		HILLSBORO		TOTAL	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Stakeholder	26	(40.0)	6	(16.7)	32	(31.7)
Public Official	5	(7.7)	4	(11.1)	9	(8.9)
Agency Representative	6	(9.2)	4	(11.1)	10	(9.9)
Interest Group Representative	3	(4.6)	2	(5.5)	5	(4.9)
Interested Individual	24	(37.0)	17	(47.3)	41	(40.6)
Other	1	(1.5)	3	(8.3)	4	(4.0)

AREAS REPRESENTED

CO./COMMUNITY	EUREKA	HILLSBORO	TOTAL
St. Louis Co.	48	4	52
Jefferson Co.	9	27	36
Franklin Co.	1	1	2
Other communities	6	4	10

The Small Group Sessions

At each of the public workshops, the meeting began with a brief general session after which the people assembled in small groups. During the small group sessions, the alternative measures that could help solve the problems were introduced with a slide presentation.

Following the presentation, the measures were discussed and participants were encouraged to identify and list additional advantages and disadvantages associated with each measure. Participants then evaluated each measure using a 1-9 rating scale, with 1 indicating a measure not preferred and 9 indicating a measure highly preferred. At the end of the workshop, we asked the people in each group to rate the meeting itself.

Results

Table 2 shows how the people rated each measure. The measures are listed from highest to lowest (most preferred to least preferred) based on the mean (or the average) score within each category (Cat). The overall ranking (All) is also shown.

One surprising result, apparent from the table, is that very few of the measures were highly preferred by the group as a whole (only one was rated at 6 or above). The ratings varied quite a bit from one meeting to the other.

The standard deviation (abbreviated S.D. in Table 2) is another value used by statisticians to analyze data. It indicates the amount of variation in the data. The smaller the standard deviation, the closer the grouping. In the case of the workshop information, where a 9-point scale was used to show preferences, a standard deviation of 3.0 or greater indicates a lot of disagreement. You might note from Table 2 that almost one-half (13 of 27) of the measures have overall standard deviations greater than 3.0.

The attendees consistently disagreed on the measures of No Corps Action and Multipurpose Reservoirs, including a Pine Ford Reservoir as a water supply solution. Even those measures ranked highest within each category showed quite a bit of disagreement with standard deviations approaching or exceeding 3.0.

TABLE 2
PUBLIC WORKSHOP RESULTS

MEASURES	RANK*		OVERALL		EUREKA		HILLSBORO	
ENVIRONMENTAL/WATER QUALITY	Cat.	All	MEAN	(S.D.)	MEAN	(S.D.)	MEAN	(S.D.)
Repair Side Slopes	1	4	5.27	(2.87)	5.23	(3.12)	5.32	(2.55)
Natural Flushing	2	8	4.72	(3.17)	4.52	(3.28)	4.94	(3.04)
Structural Condiments	3	14	4.42	(2.96)	4.33	(3.14)	4.55	(2.76)
Natural Sedimentation	4	18	4.05	(2.85)	3.15	(2.75)	5.16	(2.62)
Rehandling/Disposal of Tailings	5	19	3.98	(2.82)	4.36	(3.09)	3.51	(2.43)
No Corps Action	6	20	3.93	(3.13)	4.11	(3.24)	3.71	(3.02)
Construct Sediment Traps	7	22	3.45	(2.36)	3.07	(2.49)	3.90	(2.18)
Reroute Big River	8	26	3.06	(2.69)	2.85	(2.73)	3.33	(2.66)
WATER SUPPLY								
Water Conservation	1	5	5.20	(3.16)	4.97	(3.38)	5.50	(2.89)
No Corps Action	2	7	4.77	(3.61)	5.65	(3.58)	3.70	(3.28)
Missouri River Pipeline (Treated)	3	12	4.45	(2.94)	4.13	(3.09)	4.82	(2.75)
Pine Ford Reservoir	4	13	4.43	(3.64)	3.86	(3.37)	5.13	(3.90)
Mississippi River Pipeline	5	21	3.72	(3.12)	3.42	(3.00)	4.28	(3.32)
Missouri River Pipeline (Untreated)	6T	23T	3.36	(2.89)	3.21	(3.07)	3.55	(2.69)
Single Purpose Irondale Reservoir	6T	23T	3.36	(2.77)	3.28	(2.79)	3.48	(2.76)
OUTDOOR RECREATION								
River Access Areas	1	2	5.95	(2.96)	5.80	(3.12)	6.14	(2.78)
Greenbelts	2	3	5.60	(3.18)	5.59	(3.96)	5.63	(2.99)
No Corps Action	3	6	4.88	(3.52)	5.78	(3.50)	3.90	(3.34)
Multipurpose Reservoirs	4	10T	4.47	(3.70)	3.55	(3.32)	5.68	(3.88)
FLOODING								
Floodplain Regulations	1	1	6.83	(2.85)	6.81	(3.01)	6.86	(2.67)
No Corps Action	2	9	4.55	(3.44)	5.29	(3.38)	3.61	(3.29)
Floodwarning and Temporary Evacuation	3	10T	4.47	(3.09)	4.73	(3.30)	4.13	(2.81)
Multipurpose Reservoirs	4	15	4.41	(3.54)	3.79	(3.21)	5.24	(3.85)
Permanent Floodplain Evac.	5	16	4.26	(3.24)	4.53	(3.36)	3.84	(3.06)
Levees/Floodwalls	6	17	4.06	(2.91)	3.76	(3.14)	4.45	(2.63)
Floodproofing	7	25	3.18	(2.82)	2.97	(2.91)	3.46	(2.71)
Single Purpose Reservoirs	8	27	2.98	(2.69)	3.00	(2.96)	2.96	(2.34)

Measures You Clearly Preferred . . . Did Not Prefer

One measure, FLOODPLAIN REGULATIONS, was rated significantly higher than the others and also elicited less disagreement than most (standard deviation = 2.85). RIVER ACCESS AREAS, for the purposes of recreation, was also rated relatively high and met with considerable agreement among attendees.

The least preferred measures, based on a low mean (average) ranking and using a standard deviation below 3.0 as a sign to agreement, included SEDIMENT TRAPS and REROUTE BIG RIVER to deal with environmental/water quality problems, the MISSOURI RIVER PIPELINE (UNTREATED) and a SINGLE PURPOSE IRONDALE RESERVOIR for augmenting water supplies, and FLOOD PROOFING and SINGLE PURPOSE RESERVOIRS for reducing flood damages.

Disagreement . . . Polarity

The greatest disagreement occurred in the rating of PINE FORD RESERVOIR, MULTIPURPOSE RESERVOIRS, and NO CORPS ACTION. This disagreement was evident in all four categories. This polarity first surfaced during the October '81 workshops where strong support and strong opposition were in evidence regarding Corps involvement in developing solutions to the water-related problems in the study area. At that time the polarization was most evident toward the previously proposed Pine Ford Reservoir.

Once again, at the February workshops, PINE FORD RESERVOIR was the measure where this polarization was most evident. Most participants appeared to be either proponents or opponents of the originally authorized Pine Ford Reservoir. There were relatively few who were neutral on the subject. Considering the heavy snow cover and the frigid temperatures we experienced at the time of these meetings, it is understandable that those who attended were highly motivated.

Further disagreement in preference was also evident for the nonstructural measures WATER CONSERVATION, GREENBELTS, and PERMANENT FLOODPLAIN EVACUATION, although not as great as for the measures discussed above.

Additional Advantages . . . Disadvantages . . . Measures

During the workshops, we asked the people to help our study by writing down additional advantages or disadvantages that they believed should be considered when evaluating the various measures. We also asked for any ideas about different kinds of measures that could be used to help solve the water-related problems in the area. Many people took the extra time to write down their thoughts. We were especially glad to see that a number of people realized that the best results could be achieved by combining several measures to achieve an overall plan for the area. A number of comments identified the possibility that nonstructural measures would take a long time to implement.

One of the new measures suggested to help overcome future water supply shortages involved using excess capacity that might be available from the facilities operated by the City of St. Louis. Small reservoirs on tributaries of the Big River were also suggested to serve both water supply and recreation purposes.

How About the Meetings Themselves?

As the final workshop activity, we asked the people to grade us on whether or not we met the major objectives of (1) providing factual information, (2) providing the opportunity for interaction between the public and the Corps, and (3) providing feedback to the Corps on public preferences. A structured evaluation form was included in each Measures Evaluation Packet. The items evaluated included the slide presentations, the information packets, knowledge gained through the information techniques, the public's opportunity to clarify measures and furnish input, and the overall workshop.

As Table 3 indicates, most people believed that the meetings were successful.

TABLE 3

ITEM	% OF PARTICIPANTS	CLASSIFICATION
Slide Presentations	74%	— Helpful or Very Helpful
Information Packets	85%	— Helpful or Very Helpful
Informational Techniques	99%	— Learned Something, Quite a Bit or Very Much
Clarify Measures and Input Opportunity	87%	— Good, Very Good, or Excellent
Overall Workshop	83%	— Good, Very Good, or Excellent

We also received a number of excellent suggestions for improving the workshops. These included providing better publicity so more people would get involved and providing more time (or less information) before and during the workshops. We appreciate receiving constructive comments of this sort.

Where Do We Go From Here?

Your input regarding preference or nonpreference of the measures presented at the workshops is being used to develop plans of improvements which solve or reduce water-related problems, needs, and concerns identified within the study area. These plans will be documented in a Draft Report. This Draft Report can make one of the following preliminary or tentative recommendations:

(l) That an economically and environmentally feasible nonstructural plan of improvements should be implemented.

(2) That an environmentally and economically feasible structural plan of improvements should be implemented.

(3) That a plan having both structural and nonstructural components should be implemented.

(4) That a non-traditional plan (involving matters that are not usually the Corps' responsibility) should be implemented while deferring other features pending further study under other authorities.

(5) That no plan is available which is both economically and environmentally feasible and acceptable to the people.

This Draft Report will be reviewed internally within the Corps' organization before it is released for agency and public review.

One More Time Around

The Draft Report will be the subject of one last round of public meetings later this summer. At that time, we hope you will once again share your thoughts and opinions. This next time you will be able to assess the overall plans and recommendations for the Pine Ford Study. We will use your information to make revisions to the Draft Report so that the Final Report will reflect not only our technical requirements but also the wishes of the people.

About the Fact Sheet

The purposes of this Pine Ford Study Public Information Fact Sheet No. 3 are:

- to present summary information regarding your input at the February public meeting workshops;
- to inform you of the next steps; and to make sure you are watching for the next meeting(s) announcement.

If you have any additional questions or comments concerning the Pine Ford Study, please write or call:

US Army Engineer District, St. Louis
ATTN: Kevin Milligan
Public Involvement Coordinator
210 Tucker Blvd., North, Room 856
St. Louis, MO 63101
(314) 263-5752

PLEASE REMEMBER

YOU CAN'T COUNT ON OTHERS TO EXPRESS YOUR OPINIONS AND THE CORPS CAN'T PREPARE ACCEPTABLE PLANS WITHOUT KNOWING THE WISHES OF THE PEOPLE. SO, PLEASE PLAN TO ATTEND THE LAST ROUND OF MEETINGS.

U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DISTRICT, ST. LOUIS
CORPS OF ENGINEERS
210 TUCKER BOULEVARD, NORTH
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63101
LMS-PA

FIRST-CLASS MAIL
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
PERMIT No. G-5

100

ADMINISTRATOR (2) 111
ENV. PROTECTION AGENCY
WATERSIDE MALL
4TH AND M. STREETS, S.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20460